

Serial No. 10/641,996
Atty. Doc. No. A34482PCT-USA(071308.0207)
(1999P03046US01)

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1 & 6 and canceled claims 5 & 10. Thus, claims 1-4 and 6-9 are presented for examination. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to objections to the drawings:

Applicants have amended the Specification to comply with the reference character requirements of 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) as suggested by the Examiner.

Regarding reference character 26, Applicants respectfully submit that it is disclosed in the Specification as filed; see first line of paragraph [0013] at page 8, line 4.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the drawings.

Response to rejections under Section 102:

Claims 1-3, and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mohammed et al. (US 6,421,728 B1). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 6 to overcome the rejection.

The amended claims 1 and 6 respectively now include further limitations directed to:

- a) a successive transmission of the first and second connection requests;
- b) a special embodiment of the transmission channels being provided as one (single) distributed DCOM object (including both channels); and
- c) the Internet server being a DCOM server.

Limitation a) is supported by the Specification paragraph [0005] at page 3, line 5.

OAR_199903046US01.doc

7

Serial No. 10/641,996
Atty. Doc. No. A34482PCT-USA(071308.0207)
(1999P03046US01)

Limitations b) and c) are disclosed in the Specification paragraph [0007] at page 4, lines 15-20.

Mohammed et al. disclose a communication architecture including two separate hardware transmission devices (cable & telephone line) which require separate modems for each device; Internet technology is not disclosed in Mohammed et al.'s teachings. Consequently, they do not disclose a method for Internet communication, a successive transmission of connection requests (as a successive establishment of the transmission channels is not used when there are two physically separate hardware channels) and the embodiment of the two channels as one distributed DCOM object (including both channels) and of the server as a DCOM server, which are recited in Applicants' claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection.

Response to rejections under Section 103:

Claims 4-5 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are unpatentable over Mohammed et al. in view of Rogers et al.

Rogers et al. (US 2002/0143446 A1) disclose as general prior art the use of the DCOM protocol in Internet applications which it aims to employ for distance communication between different devices. Nowhere do Rogers et al. teach an architecture with two parallel transmission channels between a server and a client.

Modifying the teaching of Mohammed et al. using Rogers et al. could at most result in an Internet based system, wherein the hardware channels (cable and telephone) are substituted each with an internet connection each using a DCOM mechanism. There is no motivation or disclosure in Rogers to use the DCOM protocol for realizing one transmission object including

OAR_199903046US01.doc

8

Serial No. 10/641,996
Atty. Doc. No. A34482PCT-USA(071308.0207)
(1999P03046US01)

two transmission channels. For the same reason, limitation a) mentioned above is also not motivated or disclosed by Rogers et al.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6 are patentable and therefore also the corresponding dependent claims 2,3 and 7,8.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 & 10 have been canceled, and claims 4 & 9 are claims dependent from currently amended claims 1 & 6 respectively. As the latter are believed to be patentable from the Applicants' point of view (as stated in the previous section), this is also true for claims 4 & 9 depending from those currently amended independent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection.

OAR_199903046US01.doc

9

Serial No. 10/641,996
Atty. Doc. No. A34482PCT-USA(071308.0207)
(1999P03046US01)

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d) for total independent claims in excess of 3, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/14/05

By: *J.P. Musone*
John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

OAR_199903046US01.doc

10